DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 808 JC 940 449

TITLE Cutting the Cost of New Community College Facilities: Joint Use Strategies. Commission on Innovation Policy Discussion Paper Number 2.

INSTITUTION BW Associates, Berkeley, CA.; California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Commission on Innovation.

PUB DATE Jun 92

NOTE 28p.

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *College Planning; College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; *Educational Facilities Planning; *Institutional Cooperation; Policy Analysis; School Business Relationship; *Shared Facilities; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

Intended to provide background information and preliminary options for the California Community Colleges' Commission on Innovation, this document explores issues related to the construction of facilities whose use and cost are shared by various entities. Following introductory materials detailing the Commission's charge, the paper proposes that the CCC's Board of Governors rethink the strategy of accommodating growth through new facilities and stand-alone centers, and give high priority to planning joint-use facilities. Background information on joint-use facilities is provided, highlighting the following seven types of facilities: baccalaureate institution programs on existing community college campuses, community college programs on existing baccalaureate campuses, two or more community colleges in jointly-developed facilities, new intersegmental (community college/baccalaureate) facilities, community colleges sharing sites with a K-12 institution, community colleges sharing sites or facilities with business and industry, and community colleges sharing sites with government agencies. Examples are also provided of shared facilities, including plans in Colorado for a university, state college, and community college to share an educational complex; funding provided in Illinois to support regional academic centers; authorization by Florida legislation for construction of joint-use facilities; and California community colleges' history of offering credit courses at high schools, four-year campuses, leased community space, and business sites. Finally, policy options are presented for creating planning guidelines and grants, developing stricter approval criteria for building new facilities, encouraging cooperative planning, and seeking supporting legislation and funding. (Contains 20 references.) (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 808

CUTTING THE COST OF NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES: JOINT USE STRATEGIES

Commission on Innovation

Policy Discussion Paper #2

June 1992

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Weiler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Note: This paper was prepared by the staff of the Commission on Innovation to stimulate discussion. For comments, contact Daniel Weiler, BW Associates, 815 Allston Way, Berkeley, CA, (510) 843-8574, fax (510) 843-2436.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 9410 4419

ABSTRACT

Community college enrollment growth cannot all be met by expanding existing campuses and building new stand-alone campuses and centers. Cost savings will have to be realized so that available funds can purchase more facilities for the dollar.

Schools, colleges, and universities have traditionally built facilities designed to meet the particular needs of their own institutions. During the 1970s, however, a number of intersegmental efforts to plan and use facilities cooperatively began to emerge around the country. As the demand for higher education continued to increase, some states took steps to accommodate growth by funding joint-use facilities—a single facility that could meet the needs of two or more education providers. In Colorado, the legislature mandated the creation of a center in Denver at which the University, the state college, and a community college share facilities. In Illinois, the legislature has provided funding to support intersegmental cooperation, including regional academic centers. In Florida, the legislature has authorized state funding for facilities constructed or renovated for joint use by community colleges and state universities or local high schools.

California's community colleges have a long history of offering credit courses at high school facilities (particularly for occupational education "two-plus-two" programs), four-year campuses, leased space in community locations, and business sites. The colleges could provide some new facilities at less cost by expanding their use of existing space at other segments and entities and by sharing with others the construction, financing and use of new facilities. This Policy Discussion Paper proposes that the Commission consider making a recommendation to the Board of Governors that community colleges make more efforts to find, plan, and build facilities whose use and cost could be shared with other community college districts or with other segments, government agencies, or business and industry. The Paper suggests a variety of policy options that could provide means for implementing this recommendation.

CONTENTS

PREFACE i

A. OVERVIEW 1

B. BACKGROUND 2
- Colorado
- Illinois
- Florida
- California

C. POLICY OPTIONS 12

D. SUMMARY 17

APPENDIX A A-1

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PREFACE

California's community colleges are facing a period of unprecedented growth in the number and diversity of students who will seek an education before the turn of the century. More students, especially from minority and poor backgrounds, will want to enter community colleges as their best—and often only—gateway to the higher levels of education necessary for success in an increasingly competitive world. Yet the dual pressures of growth and limited budgets could reduce access precisely for those students for whom community colleges have traditionally been the principal avenue for equal educational opportunity.

Despite these pressures, the California Community Colleges are committed to insuring access for all students, and, in particular, to increasing the retention, completion, and transfer rates of ethnic minority and low-income students. To do so, the colleges realize they must introduce far-reaching changes in instructional programs, management strategies, relations with other sectors of society, and the use of facilities and resources.

The Commission on Innovation was formed by the California Community College Board of Governors in November, 1991 to address these concerns. With the colleges facing continuing budget pressures combined with unprecedented growth in student numbers and diversity, the Board realized that "business as usual" would no longer be possible, and asked the Commission to identify innovative ways in which the community colleges could respond to these challenges. The Commission was asked to write a report that proposes policies which build on the colleges' proven record of excellence in order to achieve higher quality, more cost-effective instruction and management for an era of growth and diversity marked by limited budgets.

As an aid to the Commission in its deliberations, the Chancellor has asked the Commission staff to prepare a series of Policy Discussion Papers that provide back-

ground information and *preliminary* policy options for Commission consideration. These staff papers are intended specifically to stimulate discussion from which the Commission can give direction to the staff to further the research and policy analysis process. All the papers will be widely circulated in order to facilitate discussion among community college professionals and feedback from the field. The papers, which will be based on reviews of relevant literature and discussions with community college professionals and national experts, will address nine crucial areas the Chancellor has asked the Commission and the three **Challenge XXI** Task Forces on Management, Instruction, and Facilities to consider:

1. How could facilities be more efficiently used and planned in order to accommodate growth and save money?

2. How could the colleges use technology in order to enhance learning, improve management, and increase cost-effectiveness?

3. How could partnerships between the community colleges and business be better utilized and further developed to help enhance community college growth and diversity, deal with college resource limitations, and address issues of economic development?

4. How could the community colleges work cooperatively with other education segments in order to accommodate growth and increase cost-effectiveness?

5. How could the colleges achieve continuous improvement in the quality and efficiency of their management and their services to a diverse clientele?

6. How could the community colleges become more effective learning environments for an increasingly diverse population, and in particular assure that underserved students receive the academic preparation required to prepare them for transfer?

7. What changes in system-wide and local college governance could enhance the colleges' efficiency and effectiveness?

8. How could additional revenue (from existing and/or new sources) be raised in order to help accommodate future growth?

9. What additional steps should the system take to ensure accountability for efficiency and effectiveness?

The Chancellor has made it clear that the answers to these questions must all address a common underlying theme: how the California Community Colleges can ensure access for all students, and increase the retention, completion, and transfer rates of ethnic minority and low-income students.

This Policy Discussion Paper addresses Question #1, an issue that lies at the heart of the colleges' abilities to accommodate student enrollment growth: how the cost of new facilities can be reduced so that more facilities can be obtained with available resources. The paper proposes that the Commission consider policy options that encourage community colleges to take steps to increase the number of facilities whose use and cost are shared by other community colleges and by other segments and entities.

A. OVERVIEW

California's community colleges currently serve some 1.5 million students at 107 colleges and numerous community sites and off-campus centers. The Department of Finance has projected an enrollment growth of more than 500,000 students by 2005—an increase of more than one-third. The Chancellor's Office and California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) have estimated that, in addition to the renovation and expansion of existing campuses, 14 new colleges and 23 new centers will have to be built to accommodate this student growth, at a cost, including maintenance, of more than four billion dollars.

The community colleges recognize that a four billion dollar facilities spending plan is unrealistic, and that enrollment growth cannot all be met by expanding existing campuses and building new stand-alone campuses and centers. Cost savings will have to be realized so that available funds can purchase more facilities for the dollar.

The colleges could provide some new facilities at less cost by expanding their use of existing space at other segments and entities and by sharing with others the construction, financing and use of new facilities. The colleges have a long history of using space made available by other segments, businesses, and government agencies, but joint construction and financing arrangements are relatively rare, both in California and other states. Enrollment growth and financial pressures on the community colleges provide an opportunity to re-consider joint use concepts in planning for the future.

This paper proposes that the Commission on Innovation explore recommending to the Board of Governors that the community colleges re-think the strategy of accommodating growth by building new campus facilities or constructing new stand-alone centers or campuses. The colleges would give high priority to planning facilities whose costs and use would be shared with other community college districts, other education segments, business, or government and non-profit agencies.

B. BACKGROUND

Schools, colleges, and universities have traditionally built facilities designed to meet the particular needs of their own institutions. During the 1970s, however, a number of intersegmental efforts to plan and use facilities cooperatively began to emerge around the country. These efforts often began with regional consortia, in which colleges and universities came together to meet student needs through cooperative programs and services. Some of these cooperating institutions began to consider ways to share facilities as well. Community colleges offered classes in the evenings at local high schools and universities offered classes—and eventually programs—at off-campus facilities, often on community college campuses. These arrangements were usually informal and were worked out at local levels.

As the demand for higher education continued to increase, some states took steps to accommodate growth by funding joint-use facilities—a single facility that could meet the needs of two or more education providers. States used two main approaches to joint-use higher education facilities: first, they located two or more educational institutions on one site; and second, they had one college or university offer its programs on or adjacent to the site of another, generally through a rent or lease arrangement. They also supported the development of new facilities for joint use. Colorado, Illinois and Florida all developed legislation supporting joint-use facility development among their higher education institutions.[1]

A review of the literature indicates that there are seven basic types of joint facility use involving community colleges:

---

[1]CPEC, "Joint or Shared Use of Facilities in Higher Education in Selected States," in *Technical Background Papers to Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century.* Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, Commission Report 90-2, January 1990.

1. Baccalaureate institution programs on an existing community college campus.
2. Community college programs on an existing baccalaureate institution campus.
3. Two or more community colleges in a jointly-developed facility.
4. A new intersegmental (community college/baccalaureate institution) facility.
5. A community college sharing a site or facility with a K-12 institution.
6. A community college sharing a site or facility with business or industry.
7. A community college sharing a site or facility with a city, county, or state government agency.

The main benefit of joint facility use is the ability to have one facility meet the needs of two or more education providers, thus frequently saving money over what it would cost to fund separate facilities. Often, there is sharing of facilities other than classrooms and laboratories, such as libraries, student centers, cafeterias, and health centers. In addition, educational institutions may share student services, such as counseling, financial aid assistance, or tutoring services. A joint-use facility can also permit more intensive utilization than a single-purpose facility. For example, a community college with a high demand for late afternoon and evening classes may be able to use classrooms on a university campus that often sit idle during those hours. The attraction to state funding agencies of such joint-use facilities is the ability to meet the need for more higher education facilities while using scarce tax dollars as efficiently as possible. The discussion below briefly reviews examples of joint-use facilities in several states around the country as well as California.

Colorado

Perhaps the most well-known example in the country of a joint-use facility is the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) in Denver, Colorado. Beginning in 1970, the Colorado legislature appropriated planning funds for the development of a complex that would house the University of Colorado, Metropolitan State College, and the Community

College of Denver on a 170-acre campus in the heart of Denver. The goal was to have all three institutions share one site and its facilities and expand educational opportunities for the people of the greater Denver area. In 1972, the legislature affirmed its intent to move ahead with the new complex, but with facilities utilization standards that were more intensive than those in place for Colorado's regular public higher education institutions.[2]

The Center was formalized in 1974 through legislation that provided that AHEC would have its own board to manage facilities, physical plant, buildings and grounds; allocate space among the three institutions; operate auxiliary and support services; develop long-range plans; and provide a system for facilitating cooperation among the three institutions. While the Center's original enrollment was not capped, by 1975 the legislature moved to limit enrollment to 15,000 FTE, partly due to concerns about enrollments expressed by other institutions and by the University's main campus. By Fall 1988, the Auraria Center served over 29,000 students—approximately 10,000 at the university, 15,600 at the state college, and 3,300 at the community college.

From the beginning, the impetus behind the Auraria Center was the Colorado legislature, which had the dual goals of ensuring diversity of student educational opportunities and maximizing resource effectiveness. A 1988 study requested by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education stated that the Auraria campus had achieved "a remarkably intensive level of utilization of physical facilities" and that students had access to joint resources that enriched their educational experience, including a child care center, bookstore, library, and student center. The study also noted that "support activities that are centralized, such as parking, classified personnel, physical plant, designated student services, and others, appear to offer a combination of cost control and

[2]The Colorado Legislature's Joint Budget Committee Report for FY 1970-71 stated that: "The state's commitment to a Higher Education Complex at the Auraria site should afford Colorado a unique opportunity to offer an urban-oriented educational experience with maximum program diversity and greater resource effectiveness." (Patterson and Associates, 1988.)

benefits that would be difficult for the three institutions to achieve operating separately."[3]

The report noted perhaps the most important feature of an inter-institutional center like Auraria:

> ...the interinstitutional character of Auraria has the potential for enlarging the lives of students through bringing them together with others of different backgrounds, values, and goals. Auraria has a substantial potential for introducing incoming students to the important notion that education is open-ended and a lifelong process, not one divided rigidly into discrete levels, each of which is more or less terminal.

The 1988 report also found serious management problems at the Center stemming from tensions between the three institutions' governing boards and administrations and Auraria's board.[4] "Disputes over shared use of facilities," stated one Commission observer quoted in the report, "are ultimately rooted in the lack of acceptance of the vision for operation of the Center as a student-serving enterprise rather than as an institutional-fulfillment enterprise." Nonetheless, a recent CPEC report notes that despite these problems, the Auraria Center is continuing to function much as originally intended by the Colorado legislature over twenty years ago and appears "destined to succeed in terms of serving diverse students in Colorado's capitol."[5]

The key elements of the Colorado approach include:

- legislative mandate and appropriations
- a new entity with a separate board
- separate budget approval through each institution's board
- coordinated facility master planning

---

[3]Patterson and Associates, op. cit.

[4]The boards disagreed about management of space, particularly as enrollments exceeded the planned capacity. Interinstitutional competition created problems that prompted the legislature to alter the composition of Auraria's board to include the CEOs and a board member from each of the three sharing institutions at the Center.

[5]CPEC, op.cit.

Illinois

In 1972, the Illinois legislature passed the Higher Education Cooperation Act, which authorized programs of interinstitutional cooperation and established a program of financial assistance to support such efforts. The grants program, administered by the Board of Higher Education, was intended to "implement the policy of encouraging such cooperation in order to achieve an efficient use of educational resources, an equitable distribution of educational services, the development of innovative concepts and applications, and other public purposes"[6] The fund is substantial, with $8.5 million available in 1989-90. In awarding grants to groups of institutions, the legislation requires the state Board to consider whether the proposed cooperative program substantially involves the local community, whether its function could be better performed by a single institution, and whether the program is consistent with the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education.

The types of projects to be considered include "regional academic centers" involving two or more higher education institutions serving the educational needs of an area of the state. At these centers, universities and state colleges offer upper division and graduate education programs at community college sites in areas with no other easily accessible baccalaureate or higher degree opportunities.[7] The projects may also include private colleges and universities and business and industry entities; in one case, the Quad-Cities project, services even extend across state lines into Iowa.

---

[6]Ill. Rev. Stat. 1989, Ch.144, Higher Education Cooperation Act, 1972.

[7]In the Chicago suburbs, for example, the Act provided funds to establish a multi-university center at the (community) College of Du Page; the center includes baccalaureate and graduate programs offered by private and public universities. Funding was used to remodel space at Du Page for classrooms and a computer lab; additional funding requests have been made to remodel additional space for classrooms, construct science/technology labs, fund access to library services, and provide basic administrative services. Other state-funded programs have included regional efforts to extend telecommunications networks and meet local economic development needs. (Illinois Board of Higher Education, 1988, and CPEC, op. cit.)

Illinois has specifically aimed at finding ways to enhance educational opportunities in underserved areas of the state and has focused on the development of regional consortia—with community colleges as the "basic building blocks"—that would develop multi-institutional centers. "A structure built upon community colleges has several advantages...it is built upon a history and interest in serving local and regional needs...can draw upon local and regional resources including facilities, equipment and eventually telecommunications-based instructional delivery systems. It is a structure that can encourage the active involvement of businesses and citizens that need to be served."[8] The consortia share resources—including facilities, laboratories and equipment, library materials, telecommunications systems, and academic support staff—through multi-institutional centers.

To foster cooperative efforts, the Illinois Board recommended "strong programmatic and financial incentives for institutions to cooperatively establish and join regional consortia." Citing the fact that revenues generated through off-campus operations often provided strong motivations for colleges and universities to work independently and become increasingly focused "on institutional self interests to the exclusion of student interests," the Board report concluded that "visible cooperative efforts build public confidence that educational resources are being effectively utilized; visible 'turf-wars' yield an adverse public reaction." Finally, the report noted that while the different regions of the state had different needs for educational services, they had a great similarity in expectations—for high quality educational services, for their tax dollars to be used efficiently, and for "student interests to supersede institutional interests."

The key elements of the Illinois approach include:

- legislative authorization and incentive funding
- voluntary inter-institutional cooperation
- community colleges as the basis for regional consortia
- strong support from the Board of Higher Education

---

[8]Illinois Board of Higher Education, op. cit.

Florida

In 1977, the Florida legislature authorized state funding for facilities constructed for joint use by public community colleges and state universities. Participation is voluntary on the part of the institutions. To qualify for funds, the boards of two or more public higher education institutions must adopt a joint resolution indicating their commitment to the utilization of the facility they are requesting and submit the resolution, together with needs assessments, enrollment projections and background information, to the state's Commissioner of Education. The statute sets aside funds for such joint-use facilities from a Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO) and Debt Service Trust fund, and specifies that no more than 50 percent of a facility's total funding may come from this fund (the remaining funds for the facility are to come from the participating institutions' capital outlay funds). Cooperative planning for joint-use facilities is tied to general long-range planning, with procedures that involve the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, the state office for the community colleges, the University of Florida Board of Regents, and local community college trustees.[9]

The rationale for joint-use facilities is noted repeatedly in Florida's *Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education*, which recommends specifically that "in cases where the need is compelling, any new branch or center should reflect Florida's two-plus-two approach, and should fully utilize joint programs and joint facilities between state universities, community colleges and independent institutions whenever possible." Legislative funding for such joint-use projects rose from $3.7 million in 1977 to $12 million in 1984, and by 1985, thirteen joint-use facilities had received at least partial capital outlay funding for planning and construction.[10]

Five of Florida's six regional universities—originally established as upper-division and graduate institutions—have participated in joint-use facilities programs as a means of

---

[9]CPEC, op.cit.

[10]Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, 1985.

expanding their offerings to areas of the state distant from their main campuses, primarily by locating on or adjacent to local community college campuses. The Florida Commission's 1985 report describes nine projects that illustrate the diversity of joint-use facilities in the state. These projects include new facilities shared by universities and community colleges with ancillary services provide by a local school district; merged libraries in shared facilities; renovation and shared (university/community college) use of a public school facility; and site sharing between a high school and community college (see Appendix A for a more complete summary).

The key elements of the Florida joint-use approach include:

- legislative authorization and capital funding
- voluntary cooperation by institutions
- mission and function agreements for non-duplication of programs and services
- tying of joint-use facility planning to general statewide planning for capital outlay and higher education expansion

California

A recent CPEC study noted that California has both past and present experience with shared facilities.[11] Several campuses of the California State University, including Sacramento, Fresno and Los Angeles, began as state colleges housed on what were then junior college campuses. The community colleges have a long history of offering credit courses at high school facilities (particularly for occupational education "two-plus-two" programs),[12] four-year campuses, leased space in community locations, and business sites. The State University also offers some credit courses at community colleges. Several examples of joint facility use in California are discussed below.

---

[11]CPEC, op. cit.

[12]The elementary-secondary system's State Board of Education and the community colleges' Board of Governors have created a Joint Policy Advisory Committee to plan high school - community college joint facility use for occupational education courses.

Perhaps the best known California joint-use arrangement is CSU Stanislaus-San Joaquin Delta College. The Stockton Center of CSU Stanislaus has been located at Delta for more than 17 years, an arrangement that provides students with the opportunity to earn community college, baccalaureate, and graduate degrees on the same campus. The two institutions have recently cooperated to build a new 10,000 square foot complex of modular buildings on the Delta college campus, to be occupied by CSU Stanislaus faculty and students. While the complex will give the Stockton Center its own building and identity, it will also free more office and classroom space on the Delta campus, giving the community college more class scheduling options. Delta College will lease the $1.07 million Stockton Center to Stanislaus for 10 years, at which time the building will be paid for. The Center offers ten baccalaureate programs and two masters programs. In order to provide library resources needed in university-level programs, the Center students share library facilities at University of the Pacific, an independent nearby institution. To encourage transfer, UOP also provides a special transfer financial aid package for Delta students who are Cal Grant eligible.

At the Los Rios Community College District in Sacramento a new facility for the El Dorado Education Center is now under construction. The facility will be shared with the El Dorado County Office of Education and an elementary school; the Office of Education (which has made 19 acres available to Los Rios for purchase at minimal cost) will construct a child care facility available to both the county and the college. There will also be a multipurpose, joint-use physical education facility on the site. The El Dorado Center will provide a new campus for 2,500 to 4,000 students.

Los Rios' new Folsom Lake College—now in the state approval process—includes joint-use recreational facilities to be funded with $1.5 million from the City of Folsom. A wetlands nature preserve is also included on the site, and involves cooperative funding with a local developer. The nature preserve, recreational facilities, and infrastructure may begin construction as early as Fall 1992.

The Sierra College District, located in the foothills North of Sacramento, has recently opened a Center for Applied Competitive Technologies, the first in Northern California and the eighth in the state. The $1 million center is a joint effort between private industry and the college to provide area businesses with the technology and training needed to compete successfully in a world market. IBM is a principal co-sponsor. The college-based Center features a mini-mainframe computer that drives a network of IBM PCs, and includes three advanced engineering work stations, a video projection system, and an extensive selection of manufacturing productivity software. This provides a new facility for Sierra's students and an "on-site, hands-on training center for small and medium businesses that want to learn to be more competitive, operate more efficiently, and to compete successfully in today's economy."[13]

The key element of California's joint-use approach has been voluntary cooperative effort, but proposed CPEC guidelines require higher education segments proposing new campuses or centers to address as an alternative "the shared use of existing or new facilities . . . with other postsecondary education institutions in the same or other public or independent systems."[14] Unlike the other states discussed above, California has no state funding programs that specifically encourage facilities sharing or joint-use development.

---

[13]*The Press-Tribune*, May 13, 1992, quoting Dr. Paulette Perfumo-Kreiss, Dean of Economic Development and Applied Technology.

[14]CPEC, *A Framework for Long-Range Capital Planning*. Sacramento: June, 1992, Draft. The same CPEC guidelines propose that "a higher priority shall be given to projects involving intersegmental cooperation, provided the systems or institutions involved can demonstrate a financial savings or programmatic advantage to the State . . ."

C. POLICY OPTIONS

In broad terms, the proceeding discussion suggests directions that could be pursued to extend joint use strategies in California. This might be done by expanding intra- and inter-segmental efforts to plan and build new joint-use facilities, by developing new joint use arrangements with business and industry, and by using more available space at facilities of other segments and public agencies.

Specifically, the community colleges and their students potentially have much to gain by building facilities that could be shared by two or more districts, and by joining with other segments to build joint-use facilities. The experience of California and other states suggests that joint-use facilities can expand educational opportunities and save money for all participants; there is also evidence that these facilities can be difficult to manage, and that cost savings are not automatic. Without careful, thorough, long-range planning built on a strong spirit of intersegmental cooperation, the benefits of joint-use facilities could fail to materialize.

The Chancellor's Office could take the lead in advancing joint-use facilities for the community colleges by promulgating policies designed to foster cooperation between community college districts and by initiating intersegmental joint-use planning efforts, including the investigation of regional, community college-based consortia on the Illinois model.

Joint-use arrangements with California business and industry have been mostly limited to contract education programs that specifically train employees at business sites. Community colleges and local businesses and industries are also linked through the Chancellor's Office in a program that aims to provide economic development opportunities throughout the state. These efforts provide a foundation on which to develop new

joint-use facilities with business. (The applied technology centers, developed with the help of California business and industry, also provide an example of such joint-use ventures.)

The community colleges could take the initiative to explore with business and industry leaders what kinds of incentives business would need in order to consider additional business investment in facilities designed for joint use. If such incentives could be identified, the colleges could adopt appropriate policies in areas where they have the authority to act, and play a leading role in pressing for appropriate legislation.

Finally, California's community colleges have a long history of providing instruction and other services at off-campus locations; many of these locations have been at facilities owned by secondary schools, four-year colleges or universities, or public agencies. While these off-campus locations are usually unable to provide students with the support services available on the main campus (library, counseling, language or math labs, etc.), they provide instruction and training to many students who are unable to come to a central campus due to work schedules or family commitments. Moreover, these facilities cost considerably less than would equivalent new space at a college or center; they are a cost-effective way of providing expanded educational opportunities.

The community colleges could expand their use of these off-campus facilities by intensifying their efforts to locate and use space that is often available in the late afternoons and evenings at California's public and private universities and (in the evenings) at secondary schools and public agencies.

Though more analysis is necessary to determine the cost-effectiveness of joint use policies as compared to technological and other strategies, this paper proposes that the Commission consider recommendations to the Board that encourage joint use strategies. As the discussion above suggests, the adoption of this policy could save money, expand access, improve intersegmental articulation and transfer opportunities, and foster new

partnerships with business and industry. The Chancellor's Office could take important initiatives in this area without the need for new legislation, and individual community college districts could be encouraged to work more closely with neighboring districts and institutions to plan new joint-use facilities. At the same time, the experience of Illinois and Florida, in particular, suggest that legislative support for joint-use arrangements can help greatly in encouraging cooperative planning across segmental lines.

The policy options discussed below aim at developing guidelines for planning joint-use facilities, creating incentives for planning and building such facilities, and expanding the joint use concept through the voluntary efforts of cooperating institutions and organizations.

Option 1. ***Planning guidelines.*** **Conduct analyses of joint use strategies and develop joint use planning guidelines based on experience in other states.**

The experience of other states with joint-use facilities represents a valuable source of information that remains to be mined thoroughly. The Chancellor's Office could study the experience of other states in order to determine what joint use strategies would be most likely to succeed, and could invite other segments to join in analyses of ways to move toward more joint-use facilities in California. The Chancellor's Office—or an intersegmental study team—would develop criteria and guidelines defining the circumstances under which joint-use facilities should be supported and the issues that planners of joint-use facilities should address. A thorough analysis of joint-use issues—and guidelines for joint-use facility planning—would help to persuade local district and intersegmental planners to move in this direction, and would be needed in order to secure strong legislative support for joint-use approaches.

Option 2. ***Planning grants.*** **Create a grants program to help districts that want to plan joint-use facilities.**

Few community college districts have the experienced personnel needed for joint-use facilities planning. To assist districts with this task, the Chancellor's Office could provide grants to districts for the purpose of aiding joint-use facilities planning. Districts would be able to use the grants to hire outside planning experts, obtain technical assistance for in-house planning staff, and link up with other districts that have successfully completed joint-use facilities in California and other states. The availability of planning grants would create an incentive for districts to investigate joint-use facilities as a way of accommodating student enrollment growth.

Option 3. ***Stricter facilities approval criteria.*** **Tighten the criteria for approving district plans for new facilities, to ensure that districts have adequately investigated joint-use possibilities.**

Districts planning new facilities are currently required to consult with neighboring districts, and district plans are usually approved once their neighbors attest that they do not object to the facilities being proposed. The Chancellor's Office is the agency that usually first learns that two or more neighboring districts are developing plans to serve the same growth area, and could tighten facilities approval criteria to ensure that districts work together to seriously consider joint-use facilities.

Option 4. ***Cooperative planning.*** **Create working groups with other segments and with business and industry to plan joint facilities use.**

The joint-use examples described above began with institutions working together to determine whether joint-use facilities would be the most cost-effective means of meeting particular educational needs. Once analyses and planning guidelines have been completed (see #1, above), the Chancellor's Office could

approach other segments and the private sector to form working groups for planning joint-use facilities that could benefit all parties.

Option 5. ***Legislative authorization and incentive funding.*** **Seek new legislation that supports joint-use facilities and funds joint-use planning.**

In Illinois, legislation enabling and supporting joint-use facilities was a critical element in persuading different segments to cooperate. (Enabling legislation in Illinois supports the joint use concept and establishes a fund to support intersegmental cooperative efforts. Joint use guidelines were developed by the Illinois Board of Higher Education). The Chancellor's Office (working with other segments) could seek such legislation in California, to include state financial support for joint use planning as an incentive for districts and other segments to move in that direction.

Option 6. ***Legislative support through capital outlay funding.*** **Seek new legislation that provides capital and operational funding for joint-use facilities.**

Ultimately, state funding for joint-use facility construction—whether as a special fund or a set-aside portion of all capital outlay funds—would provide the strongest support for this policy; this is the direction taken by Florida. Direct funding for joint-use construction would provide the fiscal incentive most institutions will need before they are likely to make significant commitments to joint use arrangements. Once the necessary analyses and planning guidelines had been completed (see #1, above) the Chancellor's Office could seek legislation that would provide funds for building joint-use facilities.

D. SUMMARY

This paper has suggested that the Commission on Innovation consider whether to recommend to the Board of Governors that community college districts should give high priority to finding, planning and building facilities whose use and cost are shared with other districts and with other segments and entities. The paper has reasoned that experience in other states and in California suggests that joint use strategies could save money, expand access, improve intersegmental articulation and transfer opportunities, and foster new partnerships with business and industry. The paper has offered a number of policy options for Commission consideration that could advance the implementation of these strategies.

The Commission must decide whether it would consider recommending to the Board of Governors that the community colleges adopt joint use strategies, and if so, which policy options it would also like to further develop for possible recommendations to the Board.

If the Commission decides to support the thrust of this proposal, the staff will work with the Commission, the Task Forces, other community college professionals, representatives of interested organizations, and national experts to incorporate a revised version of the policy options in the draft of the Commission report to the Board of Governors.

APPENDIX A

Joint-Use Facilities in Florida

1. University of South Florida/Edison Community College. The University was offering courses on an outreach basis in trailers, leased spaces and rented public school classrooms. When the University decided to seek a permanent site, the community college encouraged a location adjacent to its campus. Recognizing the potential benefits of such proximity, a group of local business people purchased land adjacent to the college and additional land was donated by the county. The location enables University students to use community college service facilities, such as the library, student center, cafeteria, and bookstore. The college provides all ancillary services on a contractual basis with the University.

2. Polk Community College/University of South Florida. This project involved construction of a new facility for use by both institutions in Lakeland. Neither the college nor the University has a library; both use the Polk County school system library nearby. Parking, food service, security, and some laboratories are provided by the school district, acting as a broker.

3. University of Central Florida/Brevard Community College. This is a Lifelong Learning Center operated by both institutions on the Cocoa campus of BCC, with two-thirds of the building's space dedicated to UCF and one-third to BCC. The college provides all ancillary services while the University provides its own faculty and administration. Admissions, registrations, financial aid and other administrative functions are conducted through computer connections with the main University campus in Orlando. With a long history of cooperation and goodwill, the formal agreement governing the center is only two pages long, providing the "best example that people make things work." There is joint use of the college's library, with the University suggesting to the college items which should be included on the college's acquisition list.

4. University of Central Florida/Daytona Beach Community College. Here again, a university operates on a community college campus, in a new facility that provides needed educational space for the community college as well as the opportunity to offer university-level programs for students in the Daytona Beach area. The facility is operated like the one in Cocoa, with the college maintaining the building and providing ancillary services under a brief formal agreement that provides for reimbursement on a prorated basis for utilities and custodial and other services. Library holdings are merged, as in Cocoa.

5. Florida Atlantic University/Palm Beach Junior College-North Campus. In this project a university offers programs in a new facility on the community college campus. In seeking funding for this project, the University used proceeds from the sale of one of its sites and buildings, while the community college contributed the land, with the state asked to match the value of the contributions of the two institutions.

6. Florida Atlantic University/Broward Community College/Florida International University —The Joint-Use Tower. The new tower in downtown Fort Lauderdale is to be used jointly by FAU and FIU, on land leased from BCC for $1 per year. The presidents of the three institutions agreed formally that the universities would offer only upper division and graduate work, so as not to conflict with the role and mission of BCC. The library situation is unique, since all three institutions will use the Broward County library adjacent to the tower.

7. Okaloosa-Walton Junior College/University of West Florida. This project involves renovation of a public school facility that was slated to be closed, saving substantial funds while still providing a new off-campus site for both institutions rather than new construction or expansion on an existing campus.

8. Central Florida Community College/Citrus County School District. This project was initially proposed by the school district, which needed a new high school; inclusion of the community college on the site permitted better facility usage (the college uses the facility mostly at night, with high school usage almost exclusively during the day). The director of the new center estimates that $2-3 million was saved by constructing this type of facility rather than duplicating such items as a library, classrooms, gymnasium, and parking. He believes this concept is particularly appropriate for rural areas.

9. Florida Keys Community College/Monroe County School District. This is a (primarily vocational) facility for use by the school district and the community college. The remote location of this site is seen as an important factor is its justification. The facility is operated by the school district with the college contracting for services.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benanzer, Elizabeth, Shirley A. Council, and Patricia A. Garrison. "A Rising Sun Shines on American Training." *Vocational Education Journal* 66(5). American Vocational Association, May 1991.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *A Framework for Long-Range Capital Planning*. Sacramento, CA: June 1992, Draft.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century.* Sacramento, CA: CPEC (90-1), January 1990.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. "Joint or Shared Use of Facilities in Higher Education in Selected States," in *Technical Background Papers to Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century.* Sacramento, CA: CPEC (90-2), January 1990.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Proposed Creation of a California State University, San Bernadino, Off-Campus Center in the Coachella Valley.* Sacramento, CA: CPEC (85-40), December 1985.

Elson, John. "Campus of the Future." *Time.* April 13, 1992. p. 54-60.

Florida. "Cooperative Development and Use of Facilities by Two or More Boards." F.S. 1991. *Educational Facilities,* Ch. 235.

"Greenville Technical College: Committed to New Ideas," *AACJC Journal*, April/May 1991.

Illinois. *Administrative Code.* Higher Education Cooperation Act. Title 23, Subtitle A, Ch. II, Sec. 1010.10-1010.40.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *Recommendations of the Committee to Study Underserved Areas: Enhancing Educational Opportunities.* Item #6, January 7, 1992.

Illinois Board of Higher Education, *Report on Meeting the Educational Needs of Underserved Areas*. Agenda Item 11. Springfield: March 1988

Illinois. *Revised Statutes* (1989). Ch. 144: 281-286. Higher Education Cooperation Act, 1972.

Los Rios Community College District, Office of Planning and Research. *In Touch with the Past, Shaping the Future: Los Rios and the Fourth College, A Proposal to Develop Folsom Lake Community College.* Sacramento, CA: Los Rios CCD, March 1992.

Los Rios Community College District, Office of Planning and Research. *Los Rios Community College District Long-Range Educational and Facilities Master Plan 1991-2001.* Sacramento, CA: Los Rios CCD, November 1991.

Franklin Patterson & Associates. *A Study of the Management of the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC).* Boston, MA: Franklin Patterson & Associates, September 1988. [For the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, State of Colorado]

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. *The Structure of Public Postsecondary Education in Florida.* Report 9. Tallahassee, FL: Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, April 19, 1990.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. *A Study of the Courses, Programs and Facilities at the Okaloosa-Walton Junior College/University of West Florida Joint Center in Fort Walton Beach.* Report 9. Tallahassee, FL: Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, September 10, 1987.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. *Joint-Use Facilities for Postsecondary Education in Florida.* Report 5. Tallahassee, FL: Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, March 21, 1985.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. *A Study of the Establishment of New Centers and Campuses and Long Range Potential Site Plans.* Report 7. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, October 24, 1986.

The Press-Tribune, May 13, 1992, quoting Dr. Paulette Perfumo-Kreiss, Dean of Economic Development and Applied Technology.